DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 369 FL 011 175

AUTHOR Teschner, Richard V.
TITLE Historical-Psychological Portraits as Complements to Sociolinguistic Studies in Relational Bilingualism.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 27p.: Paper presented at the Conference on Non-English Language Variation in the Western Hemisphere (Louisville, KY, October 12-14, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingualism: Code Switching (Language); English; Family Characteristics; Individual Differences; *Language Attitudes; Language Research; *Language Usage; *Mexican Americans; Parent Background; Questionnaires; *Research Methodology; Socioeconomic Background; *Sociolinguistics; Spanish Speaking
IDENTIFIERS *Language Loyalty

ABSTRACT

Language-related attitudinal differences between two bilingual students at the University of Texas at El Paso are examined. The student designated "R" is found to exhibit language loyalty to both English and Spanish. Spanish is his language of choice chiefly when his conversational partner expects Spanish. Student "L" maintains preferential loyalty to Spanish, which he uses invariably with all Mexican- Americans. R and L were raised in similar families, schooled in apparently identical environments, and live in the same neighborhood. Standard sociolinguistic questionnaires provide no explanation for the attitudinal differences between the two. Closer examination of the students' background leads to the conclusion that the differences stem from two factors. First, though both students' mothers are virtually Spanish monolingual, R's mother left her middle-class Mexican home in her twenties, after receiving a high school education, while L's mother left her working-class home in her teens, after receiving an eighth-grade education. Second, L, unlike R, spent his first eleven years and received his elementary education in El Paso's Segundo Barrio, a slum district. These findings imply that portraits of one's subjects, based on close personal acquaintance, can be a more effective research tool than standardized questionnaires. (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED184369

Historical-Psychological Portraits as Complements to Sociolinguistic Studies in Relational Bilingualism.

Paper read at "Conference on Non-English Language Variation in the Western Hemisphere," University of Louisville, October 12-14, 1979, as one of two keynote addresses.

Richard V. Teschner.
Department of Modern Languages.
University of Texas at El Paso.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard V. Teschner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

© 1979

FL011175

I propose to discuss and then expand on a sociolinguistic approach which promises to bring us closer to capturing the total picture of language attitudes and language behavior among U.S. Hispanic and other bilingual populations. The technique is termed "relational bilingualism" by its inventor, Jacob Ornstein. He first brought forth this technique in 1973; it was first presented in print in Ornstein 1978.

Ornstein begins by advocating a moratorium on psychometric approaches to bilingualism, as he is convinced that "the examination of bilingualism, by such means as reaction time tests and other psycholinguistic measures, in more or less artificial contexts, may have reached the point of diminishing returns by now" (1978:149). In this regard he cites E.C. Malherbe, who commented at the 1967 International Conference on the Description and Measurement of Bilingualism (see Malherbe 1969):

> It is doubtful whether bilingualism per se can be measured apart from the situation in which it is to function in the social context in which a particular individual operates linguistically. The only practical line of approach to this complicated problem which I can suggest is to assess 'bilingualism' in terms of certain social and occupational demands of a practical nature in a particular society. Here again the criterion is to be 'bilingualism for what'. Purpose and function are the main determinants.

Just when psychometrics approached the brink and began to teeter, along came variable-rules sociolinguistics to save the day, or so Ornstein argues: fundamental changes of emphasis were promised by the advancing methodologies of Fishman, Gumperz, Labov, Hauger, and others whom Ornstein cites as variously advocating micro-sociolinguistic approaches to societal bilingualism (Fishman 1972:250-55 and 302), interaction of small groups with language communities (Gumperz 1964) in terms of individual possession of X number of codes or styles amounting to a linguistic repertoire, peer-group affiliation as both function and product of varying language styles used (Labov 1970), and the like. The upshot then is that now may be the right time "to start shifting the emphasis radically from the linguistic to the societal dimension" (Ornstein 1978:149).

Ornstein proposes to do so with "relational bilingualism," which he defines as a technique in which "the general focus would be on the bilingual/bicultural individual and how he exists and functions within society and the 'small groups' and greater society to which he belongs" (1978:149). Relational bilingualism would be concerned with questions such as: What are the possible relationships of bilingual status "to other personal characteristics as well as to the social variables of a 'dependent' type? How do bilinguals fare, perform, and compete in the various domains of living crucial to them, by comparison with monolinguals? How do bilinguals and bidialectals measure up against monolinguals" in school and elsewhere? The method, in short, extends (1978:150)

> ... the basic concept of 'functional' as ordinarily used among linguists to cover both the linguistic and the societal axes. The linguistic dimension pays attention to the facts about [the bilingual's] ability to perform in the various language varieties he possesses, while the societal one concerns itself with how these . . . may relate to the roles played by him in society, in comparison with a 'homogeneous' monolingual/monocultural ...

Relational bilingualism, then, relates "bilingual/bicultural status (as an independent variable) to other societal variables, be they demographic, sociological, psychological, educational, or the like" (ibid.). Ornstein in his own study of El Paso informants specifically compares all the following to each other: father's education, mother's education, social class, Spanish at work, Spanish at home, in the "overall environment," in college, in church, in recreation, number of siblings, assimilation problems (by which we presume assimilation to the economically dominant if, in El Paso, numerically smaller Anglo-American society--note that in El Paso 'Anglo-American' is defined popularly as any person not entirely of Mexican descent, the qualifier being necessary to account for the not insignificant mixed-ethnic population), militancy attitude, difficulty of college Spanish (apparently "coursework in Spanish language and literature at the college level"), language preference, English capability, Spanish capability, importance of English, total score of language use, high

school rank, grade point average, math and verbal scores on the SAT, and six types of oral and written scores derived from compositions undertaken and interviews held in conjunction with Ornstein's "Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism" project at the Univ. of Texas-El Paso in the early 'seventies.

The above list of variables is impressive, yet inevitably my criticism has the following thrust: not that it was insufficiently long, but that it went nowhere as far as it could in its search for factors motivating attitudes which in turn can be hypothesized as influencing performance--in short, language behavior, and what, in the individual's socioeconomic or psychological-historical background, gives rise to it. (In all fairness I should add that computational difficulties apparently prevented Ornstein and associates from analyzing the full gamut of variables originally included in their background questionnaire.)[1] Ornstein's findings, then, while useful, serve to illustrate both the limitations of the data base of this particular study and the circumscription to which all a priori studies such as this one subject themselves to. As I will argue below, a list of variables can only achieve explanatory sufficiency if the search includes what I am going to term historical-psychological protraits of (in this case) bilingual subjects.

Before I contribute to the hopefully nascent sub-field of sociolinguistic historical-psychological portraiture, I will briefly review the findings of Ornstein 1978, pointing out what he learned and what he did not.

It is not surprising that Ornstein discovered positive relationships between good command of written English on the part of his 30 test subjects and high scores on Scholastic Aptitude Tests, high grade point averages, and the like. Even at a university which like UTEP makes certain course and even testing accomodations to that small but growing, significant and often wealthy percentage of its population which daily commutes from Ciudad Juárez, directly across the Mexican border, most classes and most standardized evaluations con-

tinue to be in English. No insights into psycho-history are needed to explain these findings. Ornstein also learned that while combined overall Spanish performance has a significant positive correlation with combined English performance it does not correlate with written English skill. He also found that "high school Spanish courses showed no correlation with performance in Spanish on our test, whereas the taking of such courses at the college level had a strong relationship with performance in the written Spanish skill" (1978:162); in all likelihood not psycho-history but simple common sense is needed to conclude that students who knew they possessed some expertise in written Spanish were precisely the ones who decided to sign up for coursework in elementary written Spanish! Interestingly, self-evaluation of Spanish skills "relates positively with actual performance, but self-evaluation of English skills does not" (1978: 162)--an indication perhaps that since English is the language that the worlds of work and school north of the border take most seriously, it is also the language the possession of skills in which might cause the timid to underrate (for fear of being "found out" on the job or elsewhere?) but the highly confident to overrate. Here then is a question for the psycho-historian to tackle. (He or she may be confounded--or not--by another finding of Ornstein's that "no relationship appeared to exist between attribution of the importance of English skills and actual performance in English," a statement open to various interpretations.)

Very useful, as Ornstein puts it, referring to findings of Grebler, Moore and Guzmán (1970), in "breaking down some long-held and cherished beliefs about bilinguals/biculturals in our society" (1978:163) are the following conclusions: that attitudes of loyalty to Spanish and English appeared to have no significant relation to performance in either, and that attitudes of loyalty to Mexican-American and Anglo cultures respectively appeared to have no meaningful correlation with performance in either Spanish or English. Grebler et al. however

were basing their conclusions on surveys conducted in San Antonio and Los Angeles, and as we can learn from the Los Angeles-based findings of David López in his important "Chicano Language Loyalty in an Urban Setting" (1978), performance or indeed the very ability to function in Spanish is greatly diminished in Los Angeles at least by the end of the third generation, except, perhaps, among small bands of language loyalists. What is more, neither Los Angeles nor San Antonio is located on the Mexican border. A possible consequence of El Paso's borderline location is that Spanish is so ubiquitous and therefore so necessary (or perhaps the opposite?; no matter--a mutual reinforcement is clearly at work) that proficiency in at least its informal spoken repertoires is simply taken for granted; similarly, in El Paso no language "loyalty" is needed to obviate diminution or extinction; it should be noted that in my three and a half years of teaching Mexican-American students and meeting them socially I have never encountered one who did not have at least some proficiency in Spanish. More interesting to the psycho-historian is Ornstein's conclusion that "a greater amount of use of Spanish in 'mainstream' contacts (that is, in work, school and formal domains) correlates positively with acknowledgment of adjustment problems to the dominant Anglo culture" (1978:162) in those areas of the city where it <u>is</u> dominant.

This, then (together with a brief conclusion about the lack of correlation between pro-Chicanoist militancy and language preference), constitutes the sum of the findings of this particular exercise in relational bilingualism as applied by Ornstein to 30 students at UTEP. In what follows I will attempt to show that a psycho-historical expansion of relational bilingualism can, if not prove (i.e., empirically) the vitality or insignificance of other insights, then at least aid (through individual anecdotes, narratively set forth) in the discovery of these insights, which in turn can be quantified empirically at some future date.

Where Ornstein used 30 subjects, I use only two. Both are former students. It should be stressed that both are now friends of mine; this is significant because I am convinced that only by having established bona fide associations with my two informants was I able to be a party to those crucial off-hand comments that reveal, unwittingly, so very much about motivation and behavior. I should add that on those few occasions when I was obligated to ask direct questions so as to fill in various gaps, the resultant responses though freely given were nonetheless accompanied by a certain embarrassment, proving yet again that language behavior constitutes a sensitive part of the core of human personality, and, like sexuality, can only be gotten at through indirection, by participant-observers.

My first friend/informant is R. As a 21-year-old El Paso-born-and-raised Mexican-American, R's background closely approximates what I know to be the typical background of many of the 30 students Ornstein surveyed in the early 1970's.

R is the oldest offspring of a Chicano father (a skilled laborer raised from infancy in El Paso though born in Mexico) and a Mexican-raised mother. The family owns their own home in a lower middle-class neighborhood which is now about 90% Hispanic but which was ethnically balanced when R first entered school 16 years ago. This historical fact is critical and, together with R's tendency toward conformism, goes a long way toward explaining how R acquired English, and how well. Though R's father is a balanced though underdeveloped bilingual, R's mother's bilingualism is strongly Spanish-dominant with only limited receptive skills in English (it should be mentioned that in El Paso it is entirely possible to live out one's life in Spanish in all domains in most neighborhoods). Over the years, R's mother has continued to insist that she receive only Spanish both within and outside the home from husband and children alike. Predominance of Spanish as a home language was reinforced by the pre-

sence, at home, of two older half-sisters the products of R's mother's first marriage in Mexico. Thus by age five, when R had first begun venturing out into the wider neighborhood, he was essentially monolingual in Spanish though he does recall knowing a little English as a result of his father's having spoken it to him on occasion, and through watching television.

According to his self-report, R entered first grade with "some" receptive skills in English, these having been picked up through neighborhood associations. It was at this point that he took the quantum leap into bilingualism. That leap was prompted by his realization (no doubt justified--bear in mind that the year was 1963) that the English-monolingual teacher favored children who could speak English. He then by his own account began to associate mainly with those schoolmates whose preferred language was English (this number included youngsters from both ethnic groups and of English-monolingual as well as Spanish-English bilingual backgrounds). Again by self-report, R had become fluent in English by the start of the following school year.

It was at this point that R's home became bilingual as the well-known pattern set in (for a recent manifestation of which see Roger Cole, "Divergent and Convergent Attitudes Toward the Alsatian Dialect," 1975, vis à vis Allemanic to French home language switches prompted by children): the four children, led by older brother R, used the language of the school for purposes of inter-sibling communication, and gradually extended that language to preferred tongue of interlocution with the one parent (the father) who not only spoke it but who also permitted it to be used with him. Present language use patterns in R's home (I should add that like most UTEP students he lives at home and commutes to campus) are therefore predictable: English is used roughly 90% of the time for communication between R, his two younger sisters both still at home, and his younger brother; when Spanish is used (the remaining self-reported 10 per cent of the time) it is for purposes of, as R puts it, "emphasis," i.e., the well-

known device of foregrounding. Yet Spanish is very much alive as a home language. R's mother sees to that. The family rule of thumb is that all verbal interaction involving the mother must take part in Spanish even though the mother is not directly addressed by the particular conversational turn; thus in a speech event involving R, his brother, his two sisters, his father, and his mother, the sole language is Spanish. With the departure of the mother, however, the medium of exchange becomes English.

Viewed as a setting or domain, however, the "home" is clearly a bilingual entity, though it is evident that the prime factor guaranteeing Spanish maintenance is the mother. Yet the mother is best viewed as a sort of spoke in a vast Spanish reinforcement machine, since R's family is regularly visited by (and regularly visits) a small army of the mother's parents, aunts and uncles, cousins, in-laws, godparents, godchildren, and friends from Chihuahua city, 242 miles to the south of El Paso. (The less-numerous relatives of the father on the other hand are hardly ever related to, with the exception of an aunt who lives in California and who speaks to all but R's mother in English--though the aunt by profession is a Spanish teacher!) As younger children, R and his siblings were frequently taken on visits to Chihuahua and R himself has internalized this particular route to the extent that he visits Chihuahua, alone or with relatives or schoolmates, about three times a year.

Strong countervailing forces, then--explicit and thorough equation of "school" as an English-speaking domain coupled with academic over-achiever attitudes and results, plus consistent participation in English-only school activities such as editing the highschool newspaper and serving, at UTEP, as chairman of a major student-faculty committee, paired off with well-maintained ties to the interior of Mexico along with full-scale retention of Spanish as the (literally) mother tongue at home--have served to develop in R a wide range of superficially antithetical attitudes toward language, toward language use in

the home domain and in society, and toward ethnic aggrupations identifiable in part by language or language behavior.

To give some examples: On the one hand, R is currently worried about what he perceives to be his three nieces' "slowness" in acquiring English (the three are the pre-school-age children of one of his older half-sisters who, now divorced and working full-time, regularly leaves them with R's mother during the day). On the other hand, R is quite critical of certain Mexican-American friends of his whose command of Spanish is, as he puts it, "obscene," i.e., poor. R's complex of ethnosocial attitudes is at first blush contradictory, and represents an interesting variation on the theme of divided loyalty; while on the one hand he has voiced severe criticism of not only Mexico but of Mexicans (to the extent of telling me a long series of genuinely "obscene" Mexican jokes on occasion), on the other hand he has an almost mystical belief in the ability of Mexican oil to improve Mexico, and is sensitive to out-group criticism of Mexico that is not in accord with his own perceptions of that country's reality. In light of his worries over the three nieces' failures to pick up English at an early age, it is revealing that he became quite emotional in the fall of 1978 about the locally famous "Reséndez" case in which a Mexican-American was fired from his job as clerk in the mailroom at El Paso's _____ Bank by an English-monolingual black supervisor who, having established an English-only policy in his section of operations, objected to Reséndez's speaking Spanish during work hours. (When the local court ruled in favor of the bank, which Reséndez had sued, a boycott was organized, demonstrations were held, much money was reportedly withdrawn, and the supervisor was last seen signing up for night courses in Spanish.) I should add that while R strongly supported Reséndez's right to use Spanish on the job, R's father, who was Spanish-dominant for a much longer time that R, took the opposite stance.

While R himself shows relatively few of the oral stigmata of bilingualism

in that his command of English is totally native (after three years of my hearing him speak it, the only feature of phonology, grammar, lexicon or intonation that I find attributable to non-nativeness whether primary or secondary is a tendency to produce a higher percentage of non-schwaed monosegmental singular indefinite articles than would the hypothetical average native Anglomonophone; thus, greater frequency of /a^{i}bɔte^{i}ha^{u}s/ than of /a^{i}bɔtəha^{u}s/, etc.) and his command of Spanish native as well, R is nonetheless quite aware of and worried about his inability to perform well in the acrolects of Spanish while discussing certain topics, especially, of course, "school" topics, given that his education has been uniformly anglophone with the exception of two semesters' worth of first-year course work in "Spanish for Native Speakers" at UTEP. Periodically R talks of taking a summer off to study in Mexico, yet his plans to do so keep getting postponed because of self-generated pressures to finish up at UTEP and then move on to graduate work in business or law. Relatively free of stigmata, R is also highly adept at determining which language or combination of languages to use with which interlocutor. Shortly before putting these observations to paper I deliberately engaged R in a long discussion about his strategies for negotiating, or, more often, for rapidly deciding on language choice, especially with interlocutors not previously known to him. As I believe to be true of most Mexican-American bilinguals in El Paso, R's skills in this area are highly developed and reminiscent of those described by Monica Heller (1978), reporting on language choice negotiations in Montreal. Merely by limiting myself to an analysis of R's self-report on language-choice strategies I would have enough material for a separate monograph, so what follows here is a very brief encapsulation of those tactics for initiating conversations with persons unknown to him and whom he has yet to hear speak:

All Anglos are addressed in English. Those few persons whose pigmentation, hair, manner of dressing or kinesics do not suffice to assign them an ethnic

classification are spoken to in English, but hesitatingly, since on such occasions R expects the interlocutor to provide the clue. Hispanics whose clothes and gestures designate them as from Ciudad Juárez or elsewhere in Mexico are given Spanish; older Mexican-Americans (middle-aged and up) are given Spanish; younger Mexican-Americans are usually given English unless the setting is one of the several El Paso neighborhoods in which Spanish is known to predominate in all domains (i.e., where Spanish is the base language among all Hispanics of all generations). R admits that the greatest difficulty in language choice involves Mexican-Americans of roughly his own generation in non-barrio settings such as the UTEP campus. His strategy there is generally to attempt to overhear a given potential interlocutor verbally interacting with other Mexican-Americans of the same generation before deciding which language to use or whether to use both (in code-switching); however if such is not possible, R will initiate the interaction in English, all the while closely observing his interlocutor's responses to determine whether a switch to Spanish would be wise.

There are other dimensions to R's sociolinguistic personality which must be mentioned if a full explanation of his behavior is to emerge, yet I will wait to name them until after I have begun providing a portrait of my second friend/informant, L.

A complete SES portrait of L and R would produce an almost identical set of figures. Both are of an age (L is one year younger than R), both were born in El Paso, both are Mexican-American, both are upperclassmen at UTEP, both are sons of blue-collar fathers, both have several brothers and sisters younger than they, both intend to do graduate work, both are actually the products of the same grade school and the same highschool and even live in the same neighborhood, in fact on the same street, four blocks from each other (I should add that they are only superficially acquainted). Yet a description of the language attitudes and languabe behavior of L yields a very different set of results

from those ascribed to R.

L was a student of mine in a Spanish for native-speakers class (though not at the same time as R). Whereas R as a student was quiet, almost shy, seldom volunteering answers or asking questions during class, L was extremely out-going, frequently responding to requests for information, often interjecting appropriate and well-timed wisecracks into class discussions, and occasionally coming up to consult with me after class--always in Spanish. (R would also sometimes drop by after class, though he would invariably address me in English. I should add that these Freshman-level classes are supposed to be taught only in Spanish and that these directives are faithfully followed, at least by the faculty. Yet a certain percentage of students uses mostly English when initiating requests for information from the professor as opposed to responding to the professor's request for an answer. Though no research has been performed on whether the same percentage of English is used when addressing Anglos who teach these courses as when addressing Hispanic teachers--such research would be fruitless in any case since of the eleven faculty who are teaching those courses this year, only one is Anglo--anecdotal evidence confirms my suspicion that if the student who prefers or is conditioned to use English in all classroom settings perceives that the teacher has any working command of English and any willingness to receive that language, such a student will use English, contrary to course goals.)

L, then, became fixed in my mind as a Hispanophone loyalist perhaps eager to extend usage of Spanish to domains presently not favoring it according to El Paso's overall rules of speaking (an impression confirmed by a composition of L's protesting what he correctly perceived to be the pro-English "tilt" of the highschool both he and R attended, which though long ago having abolished its "No Spanish" rule has nonetheless resisted suggestions that Spanish be given co-official status as a working language on campus). Bi-valent polarization of personality, however, is perhaps nowhere better illustrated than in the case

of L, who, ideology and in-class or class-proximate language behavior notwithstanding, since the end of the course has consistently addressed me in English wherever we meet. I should note that his English though perfectly native Anglophone in syntax and lexicon is nonetheless moderately typical of what has been termed "Chicano English" by Garland Bills (1977), Allan Metcalf (1979), and others: an intonation pattern divergent from that of Anglo English dialects in that it represents a sort of compromise between Spanish syllable-timing and English stress-timing; a lower-than-Anglo-English percentage of schwas in unstressed syllables; a less-than-complete aspiration of voiceless stops in environments other than post-sibilant, etc.

L's personal rules of speaking which language to whom also differ markedly from R's. L for example will invariably choose Spanish as the language with which to initiate verbal interaction with <u>all</u> persons of Mexican ancestry on both sides of the border. When asked whether he would insist on continuing in Spanish even though his interlocutor switched to English or gave out cues (such as hesitancy, lack of cooperation, anger, etc.) of eagerness to do so, L indicated he <u>would</u> switch to English though the other person would be lowered in his estimation for initiating or suggesting the switch. However, L's rules of language choice agree with R's vis à vis Anglo interlocutors, as evidenced by L's refusal to speak any more Spanish with me regardless of setting; initially I had assumed that his unwillingness to use Spanish with me stemmed from what Simon R. Herman (1961) would refer to as the "predominance of the immediate situation," in this case the fact that UTEP is viewed as an English-language institution of higher learning, that our encounters took place on its campus, that I am a professor at the institution, and that these meetings, taking place as they did in crowded hallways, were surrounded (so to speak) by persons who might presumably view any Spanish-medium contact between Chicano and Anglo as contrary to community norms (I should add that at UTEP, Hispanics are still a

numerical minority, though at roughly 40 percent a substantial one; in the north-of-the-border metropolitan area itself, Hispanics constitute at least 60 percent of the population). Nonetheless L continued to use only English with me during subsequent visits to my office. When asked why he had used only Spanish with me in the classroom and near it, he replied "Because you speak it well." When I wanted to know why he no longer spoke Spanish to me (a question he was reluctant to answer) he responded "Because it's not your language." When asked why certain students (including some in the section he attended) gave me English during class, he theorized that "It's because their Spanish isn't very good"--a supposition contrary to fact in many instances.

To conclude this portrait of L, I turn to language-usage patterns and attitudes in his home, where he, like R, is the older brother in a medium-sized family. Again, the biographical data of L's and R's parents offer many similarities. L's father was born in El Paso and L's mother in Mexico, from which she emigrated as an adolescent. L's father is a Spanish-dominant bilingual; L's mother though able and willing to produce occasional English is almost as Hispanophone in her bilinguality as R's mother, i.e., she enjoys largely receptive skills in English. If these and other background factors are similar, though, language-behavior results (i.e., choices of language at home) are not. L's family (according to his self-report) is of the code-switching persuasion, a widespread solution to the ever-present bilingual community problem of language choice (i.e., of how to give as little offense as possible to sensitive persons on both sides of the "fence"). L reports that he and his siblings code-switch "all the time," using neither language as the base (obviously this self-evaluation may be flawed, but nonetheless contrasts interestingly with R's evaluations of same-generation home-language use). To be sure there are intergenerational and especially matrocentric differences between the percentage of English involved in the switches, yet according to L's anecdotes, even his

mother will switch into her limited English both inside and outside the home--something R's mother never does anywhere on any occasion when conversing with members of her own family. In response to further inquiry, L commended that while he recognized the benefits of knowing English well, it was immaterial to him whether any younger relatives of his failed to acquire the language at any early age, "since they'll always pick it up later when they're forced to in school," just as he indicated after he had ceased to be my student that he could "care less" about expanding or adjusting his Spanish lexicon and orthography to conform to educated Mexican norms, "since I know more than enough Spanish to get along here in El Paso and when I go across the river to Juárez."

A clear picture of the differences between R and L has now emerged. Both R and L are Spanish language loyalists but in divergent ways--R is less tolerant of "bad Spanish" among Mexican-Americans but more tolerant of their using English and personally more willing to use English with other co-ethnics, while L expects them to conform to his ideology vis à vis language selected (it should be Spanish) but is more tolerant than R of socially marked features or of features the product of English influence (which he, in turn, in his own Spanish, selectively used in class to a far greater degree than did R). R disavows code-switching (though will use it with fellow ethnics for whom it is clearly the norm, albeit only inter- not intra-sententially, according to his own heated assertion) while L employs it at home and with friends (in clear contradiction of earlier pronouncements about speaking "only Spanish" with all other Mexican-Americans). R, in short, conforms more to <u>both</u> Anglo language-use expectations <u>and</u> to exocentric (in this case Mexican) attitudes regarding correctness in Spanish. L on the other hand operates in disconformity to both Anglo and Mexican standards; his attitudes and behavior patterns some would be quick to say are "typically Chicano."

What can account for these differences in two persons from very similar

backgrounds who live in close geographic proximity? How, in short (following the lead of Derek Bickerton, 1971 and 1973) can individuals' linguistic performance and attitudes vary from common denominators with the result that neighbors differ from neighbors?

So far I have given out most of the clues needed to solve this particular puzzle but have held back on a rather crucial one, and, unpardonably, have failed to give sufficient emphasis to clues that were mentioned almost in passing. I did so in part so as once again to be able to make critical reference both to Ornstein 1978 and to the sociolinguistic testing instrument on which its findings were based.

For both L and R, a highly crucial element is the role of the mother. This is especially true in R's case. Not only did R's mother receive all her formal education in Mexico, she also received a fairly formal education in Mexico--partly into the preparatoria or, in U.S. terms, roughly through the last year of highschool. Likewise she did not leave Mexico until her late 'twenties. Given her educational background it is proper to assume (as is indeed the case) that she is of middle-class extraction, as are all the many relatives in Chihuahua with whom such close contact is maintained. L's mother on the other hand though born and raised in Mexico arrived in El Paso during adolescence (though after the critical age of 13). Her formal education went through the eighth grade only. She is of working-class extraction. As is the case with R's mother, frequent contacts are maintained with relatives, all of whom however live in El Paso and all of whom are working-class SESs.

The point is that had R and L filled out the Brooks et al. sociolinguistic background questionnaire (Brooks, Bonnie S. et al., 1972) which formed the basis for the conclusions presented in Ornstein 1978, just one of the 102 questions, no. 40, would have provided us with anything close to an insight into what appears to be a main motivating factor in the important attitudinal and behavioral

differences between R and L. Question no. 40 asks: "How many years of school did your mother complete? (Circle One)" The gradations are: Year 1-6; year 7-8; year 9--and then each subsequent numerical year through "year 19 (Doctorate)." From these points on a scale, L would have circled "year 7-8" (point 2), R "year 11" (point 5, or perhaps "year 12" = point 6, though given the disparity between educational systems he could legitimately have selected either). This three- or four-point difference alone would not have provided that momentous a clue; furthermore the point difference merely implies a search for what the rest of the questions on Brooks et al. do not make way for, namely, the class-background specifics and the closeness of ties with the interior of Mexico. One more objection: only question no. 44 refers to visits to Mexico, but limits these to Ciudad Juárez and nowhere makes allowance for the possibility (clearly conducive to creating attachments to Mexican prestige norms in R's case) of visits to the interior of Mexico, and, more importantly, for what purpose (I posit that a visit to relatives or friends will be of greater linguistic consequence than a trip from town to town, hotel to hotel, in the company of other persons from El Paso--in fact R himself refers to his visits to Chihuahua and the relatives as "language immersion sessions," with the language of course being Spanish).

The strong influence of the mother and her kinship network and class background, then, seems to explain R's simultaneous allegiance to Mexican and Anglo norms. (The connection between maternal influence and allegiance to Anglo norms--though the mother resolutely speaks no English--can nonetheless be explained as a function of class and status and the mother's encouragement that her children "achieve" in a largely Anglo-dominated society.) Similarly, absence of these pressures would explain the absence of such a twin allegiance in L. But it does not offer much of a clue as to the presence in L of other attitudes and behavior forms which R lacks.

The clue to L's divergencies lies nowhere in any of the 102 questions on

Brooks et al. 1972, and especially not in question no. 9 ("Name and location of last elementary school attended: Name/city/state/country") since as I have indicated, L graduated from the same elementary school as did R, and only a year later. L, however, did not complete the greater part of his elementary schooling at that particular school, because his family resided in another neighborhood until L was about to enter the sixth grade; and this turns out to be the clue that explains so much of L's Weltanschauung or attitudinal/behavioral complex. From birth through age eleven, L and family lived in south El Paso, also known as the Segundo Barrio (purportedly a calque of the English 'second ward'), which is the one neighborhood in El Paso and probably the entire Southwest that is held to typify the capital-letter Barrio Chicano. All the extensive literature on pachucos makes reference to it (see Teschner et al. 1975, Bills et al. 1977). At present, while only about 10% of the city's Mexican-descent population lives in the 98-block area of the Segundo Barrio (whose geographical parameters are, on the west, south, and east, the Rio Grande--whose concrete channel marks off the international border between the two halves of our twin cities--and, on the north, the railroad yards and El Paso's downtown area), the Segundo is nonetheless believed by Anglos and Hispanics alike to represent the "essence" of Chicanismo, however defined or reacted to (i.e., if one holds pro-Movement attitudes one relates positively to the Segundo and what happens there). The 98-block neighborhood physically and socioeconomically is a standard inner-city slum. Politically the Segundo has been the scene since the mid-1960's of frequent agitation, which continues today. The area's strategic location so proximate to freeways, railroads, international bridges and the downtowns of both cities has made it a prime target for land speculators and industrial re-developers, so the current political issue is the preservation of the zone's residential character (or what is left of it).

In any event, local Mexican-American folkwisdom asserts that it is always

possible to pick out persons who live or have lived in the Segundo Barrio by their clothing, manners, attitudes, and speech. I find this entirely plausible; children are adept at learning their larger communities' ways of speaking and behaving and at using these as yardsticks. Children also develop loyalties to class, religion, group, sociolect, geolect or neighborhood, all the more so if the group or lect or residential area has special salience. Such, then, is what happened to L (in fact when I told him what I had surmised he readily admitted it; earlier, through acquaintances, I had pieced together L's complete schooling and residential history). He formed many behavior patterns and loyalties in the Segundo Barrio and largely retained them when he changed neighborhoods and schools at age eleven. His retention was aided by two additional factors: (1) the influx into this particular new neighborhood by others from his or other adjacent zones where similar (though perhaps less intense) attitudinal configurations prevail; and (2) the dichotomization and resultant rivalry between "old kids" and "new kids" that this influx produced.

R then was clearly an "old kid" and L a "new kid" in that neighborhood at that point in history. Communality of neighborhood, paternal SES ranking, ethnicity, generation, sex, religion, parental places of birth, school, and general vocational aspirations notwithstanding, R and L turned out differently, in part because of maternal attitudes, in part because of early childhood experiences.

R and L's modest contributions to the sociology of language can be said to have two implications. The first is that the Brooks et al. (1972) sociolinguistic questionnaire needs expansion. But how far to expand it? We may echo this question by tampering with someone else's title and ask: How far should attempts at explaining the sociolinguistic variable go? If individual variation can be explained in terms of SES or generation or gender and so on, the answer is: Not far at all. However if (as was the case here) it can not, my answer (and the second implication) is: expand the <u>questioning</u>, though not necessarily the

questionnaire, as far as is necessary to obtain the explanation that makes intuitive sense, to produce those inductive elements obtainable by inspection--or introspection?--rather than by quantification. Questionnaires such as Brooks et al. (1972) with slightly more than 100 questions (many containing subdivisions) become unwieldy, tire the respondent (to the point where through negative feelings toward the test instrument, the responses themselves may get falsified?), and produce, in any event, something which Ornstein himself notes (1978:160) is an "extensive 'correlational matrix'" that is "mind boggling . . . and not conducive to easy analysis." So the answer must sometimes be a transcendence of the instrument to the extent necessary to learn why neighbors differ. Ornstein notes (1978:160) that to discover and interpret the implications of "the statistics and neat rows of columns with their impressive apparatus[, t]he addition of humanistic data and insights is also necessary . . . " Quite so; it is sometimes even necessary to get to know one's respondents.

For just one example of how getting to know one's respondents would have helped resolve an important unanswered question whose glossing over constitutes an unfortunate moment in an otherwise impressive lifetime of research, I need only turn to a recent (1977) piece by Wallace Lambert, "The Effects of Bilingualism on the Individual: Cognitive and Sociocultural Consequences," in which are discussed, among other things, some findings from an earlier research project of his (Aellen and Lambert, 1969).

Here Lambert reports on adjustments made by the offspring of mixed marriages in Montreal, and how the adolescents studied identify ethnically. He and Aellen sought to learn whether the demands made on such children, who are "usually expected to learn the distinctive social and behavioral characteristics of the two cultures represented in their families," (1977:20) will necessarily generate conflicts, or "whether the experience with two cultures possibly broadens and liberalizes the child . . . " (ibid.) Such was undertaken by comparing large numbers of male adolescent products of mixed marriages with control groups from

both English-only and French-only marriages. Aellen and Lambert determined that "the profile of characteristics of the boys with mixed ethnic parentage is a healthy one in every respect ..." and that "rather than developing a divided allegiance or repressing one or both aspects of their background . . . they apparently have developed a dual allegiance that permits them to identify with both their parents" (1977:21) and by extension with both ethnic groups. So far so good, but in a subsequent paragraph Lambert throws his own conclusions off balance by admitting that there were actually two general modes of adjustment to a mixed ethnic background. Only in one subgroup did the subjects "incorporate both ethnic streams of influence" which in any case "are either modified by the parents before they are passed on to their children, or are tempered by the adolescents themselves, so that they are less extreme than those represented by either of the major reference groups." (1977:21-22) In the other subgroup, subjects show themselves to be the products of the well-known "playground effect" (for just one of many examples in the literature see Carroll Barber 1973) in that "they tend to adapt their views to the predominant features of the academic-cultural environment in which they find themselves. This form of adjustment is suggested by the tendency of the mixed ethnic groups to line up with the respective homogeneous groups with whom they attend highschool, e.g., in their choices of the values they hope to pass on to their own children, the personality traits they see as desirable, and their judgments of the relative attractiveness of English-Canadian or French-Canadian girls." (Lambert 1977:22)

Now the causes of such a division of the subjects into subgroups (those who go against or with the grain of the "playground effect") are clearly of interest to the student of the sociolinguistics of bilingualism. Yet Lambert immediately beggars his own question by stating: "This illustration provides hope for biculturality in the sense that offspring of mixed-ethnic marriages appear to profit from the dual cultural influences found in their families. Rather than

cultural conflicts, we find well-adjusted young people with broad perspectives who are comfortable ... " (ibid.) etc., etc. Quite apart from umbrage to be taken at Lambert's cavalier dismissal of one of his own research findings (intentionally overlooked, perhaps, so as to reach a conclusion consonant with liberal or, in the Canadian political context, Liberal sentiment), as linguists who are interested in motivation and cause as well as result and applicability we can only regret that Lambert made no attempt to determine what caused one subgroup to turn out one way, the other another way. Lambert earlier provides a possible clue in the form of a suggestion (following A.I. Gordon, 1966, and J.F. Saucier, 1965) that

> . . . the children of mixed ethnic marriages may face other difficulties to the extent that their parents . . . may have married outside their ethnic group because of personal instability and immaturity . . . [and may have] relatively strong feelings of alienation, self-hatred, and worthlessness, and are disorganized and demoralized . . . On the other hand, people may intermarry . . . because they have developed essentially healthy attitudes and orientations which are nonetheless inappropriate within their own ethnic group, making intermarriage with a sympathetic outsider particularly attractive. (1977:20)

Lambert suggests (but does not follow up on) the possibility that the children of the first group "might well find it difficult to identify with their parents" and might thus be even more receptive than the average child to "playground" influences, perhaps to the extent that they would over-identify with one ethnic group or the other; he also mentions the possibility, uninvestigated, that offspring of the second group might be "particularly well trained in tolerance and openmindedness ... " (1977:20) A desired follow-up to the Aellen/Lambert study would want to base itself on some sort of narrowly-gauged personal background questionnaire along with an attempt by the investigator to "get to know" the respondents. Among possible lines of investigation (both questionnaire-bound and interview-elicitable): can preference for one parent over the other be tied in with allegiance to that parent's group of ethnic origin? Does ethnically-based rejection by one parent's relatives guarantee that the language

of the home will be that of the other parent's ethnic group or that the offspring will show strong preference for the ethnic group of the non-rejecting relatives? Are a certain number of friendships with other products of mixed marriages necessary to bring about Lambert's cherished dual-allegiance phenomenon or is it possible for mixed-marriage offspring to develop dual-allegiance even while associating primarily or solely with mono-ethnic children? Is dual-allegiance less the product of environment (whether familial or neighborhood) than of personality type (granting that inevitably the relationship between "personality" and "environment" is a complex one--perhaps the best way to test this hypothesis is to determine whether children of the same family or, better yet, twin children of the same sex can develop differing ethnolinguistic allegiance patterns)?

These and similar questions could have been asked by Lambert. These and similar questions can be asked by all researchers seeking to get to the root causes of language attitudes and language behavior. Human behavior is complex, bilingual human behavior inevitably more so. A full appreciation of such a complex phenomenon can only result from a serious attempt to interest oneself in the psycho-history as well as the statistical data of our subjects, even at the "risk" of forsaking what Robert St. Clair (1980, in press) has termed "the positivistic quest for consistency," and for which he suggests the remedy of "symbolic interactionalism [which] allows diversity to thrive within a family resemblance model and assumes that people have different repertoires of cognitive strategies which they employ in defining the context of a situation."

By definition a questionnaire is a finite measuring instrument; inevitably then, for causation to be understood and complexity fully presented, the questionnaire must be transcended. Only thus can we have progress in relational bilingualism or in any other sociolinguistic approach. Even the best sociolinguistics often suffers from the failing of so much social science: the discovery of striking facts whose significance is unclear precisely because the

underlying social phenomenon is more complex than the experimenters' theories admit. Or the phenomenon may be very simply, yet remain undiscovered merely because the testing instrument had no slot for it to fill.

N O T E S

[1]As Ornstein mentions (1978:160): " . . . our team . . . identified 79 variables . . . [but] all variables could not be considered for this type of (Pearson product-movement correlation) analysis because of the manner in which the coding and card-punching was performed."

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Aellen, C. and Wallace E. Lambert. 1969. Ethnic identification and personality adjustments of Canadian adolescents of mixed English-French parentage. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science 1.69-86.

Barber, Carroll G. 1973. Trilingualism in an Arizona Yaqui village. Bilingualism in the Southwest, ed. by Paul R. Turner. Tucson: Univ. of Arizona Press, pp. 295-318.

Bickerton, Derek. 1971. Inherent variability and variable rules. Foundations of Language 7.457-92.

_____. 1973. The structure of polylectal grammars. Georgetown University Round Table 25, ed. by Roger W. Shuy. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press, pp. 17-42.

Bills, Garland D., Jerry R. Craddock and Richard V. Teschner. 1977. Current research on the language(s) of U.S. Hispanos. Hispania 60.347-58.

Bills, Garland D. 1977. Vernacular Chicano English: Dialect or interference. Journal of the Linguistic Association of the Southwest (LASSO) 2:2.30-6.

Brooks, Bonnie S., Gary D. Brooks, Paul W. Goodman and Jacob Ornstein. 1978. Sociolinguistic background questionnaire: A measurement instrument for the study of bilingualism. El Paso TX: The University of Texas at El Paso/Cross-Cultural Southwest Ethnic Study Center, 2nd ed. 1972. Unnumbered pp.

Cole, Roger. 1975. Divergent and convergent attitudes toward the Alsatian dialect. Anthropological Linguistics 17.293-304.

Fishman, Joshua A. 1972. The sociology of language: An inter-disciplinary social science approach to language in society. Advances in the sociology of language, ed. by Joshua A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton.

Gordon, A.I. 1966. Intermarriage. Boston: Beacon Press.

Grebler, Leo, Joan A. Moore and Ralph Guzmán. 1970. The Mexican-American: The nation's second largest minority. New York: Free Press.

Gumperz, John J. 1964. Linguistic and social interaction in two communities. American Anthropologist 66:6.137-53.

Heller, Monica. 1978. 'Bonjour, Hello?': Negotiations of language choice in Montreal. Working Papers in Sociolinguistics, No. 49 (Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory). 15 pp.

Herman, Simon R. 1961. Explorations in the social psychology of language choice. Human Relations 14.149-64. (Rpt. in Readings in the sociology of language, ed. by Joshua A. Fishman, The Hague: Mouton, 1968, pp. 492-511.)

Labov, William A. 1970. The study of language in its social context. Studium Generale 23.30-87.

Lambert, Wallace E. 1977. The effects of bilingualism on the individual: Cognitive and sociocultural consequences. Bilingualism--Psychological, social, and educational implications, ed. by Peter A. Hornby. New York: Academic Press. Pp. 15-27 (see esp. pp. 20-22).

López, David. 1978. Chicano language loyalty in an urban setting. Sociology and Social Research 62.267-78.

Malherbe, E. C. 1969. Discussion. The Description and measurement of bilingualism, ed. by L. Kelly. Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press. P. 50.

Metcalf, Allan. 1979. Chicano English. Arlington VA: Center for Applied Linguistics. 31 pp.

Ornstein, Jacob. 'Relational bilingualism'--A new approach to linguistic-cultural diversity and a Mexican-American case study. 1978. Ethnicity 5.148-66.

Saucier, J.F. 1965. Psychiatric aspects of inter-ethnic marriages. Unpublished paper, McGill University, Montreal.

St. Clair, Robert. 1980 (in press). Language and diversity: A sociolinguistic perspective. A festschrift for Jacob Ornstein: Studies in general and socio-linguistics, ed. by Edward L. Blansitt, Jr. and Richard V. Teschner. Rowley MA: Newbury House.

Teschner, Richard V., Garland D. Bills and Jerry R. Craddock. 1975. Spanish and English of United States Hispanos: A critical, annotated, linguistic bibliography. Arlington VA: Center for Applied Linguistics. xxii, 352 pp.